City of Kirkland, WA
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 08-10-IT

Questions and Answers Submitted as of Wednesday, April 14, 2010

1. Section II REQUIRED PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMS, Item F, refers to years of experience in telecommunications (?). (Answer: the city apologizes for this typo; replace telecommunications with mapping and/or GIS implementation.)

2. Will there be an opportunity for follow-up questions? (Answer: city policies do not allow follow-up questions)

3. In Section I General RFP Information, Item A, Street infrastructure bullet, what does the "etc." refer to? (Answer: please ignore the "etc.")

4. Is additional documentation on each GIS data type available, such as data dictionary, data model, relationship classes, geometric networks, etc.? (Answer: the city's enterprise GIS includes detailed content enabling its use in a variety of business systems. It is not within the scope of this solicitation to fully describe each of the GIS data layers listed in the RFP. The city's intent is to have a vendor [or vendors] complete the parcel mapping, and if funding becomes available for additional work, proceed with those data layers in priority order. The cost proposals asked for in RFP Section II REQUIRED PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMS, Item J, are to be planning-level estimates and not firm bids. Firms may provide a price range, and will not be evaluated on these amounts in the proposal scoring. The level of attribute coding desired on the various data layers can be seen in the appendix at the end of this document.)

5. Is there a requirement to capture and attribute the surface water utility conveyance network (pipes)? (Answer: yes.)

6. Does the city have access to any electronic or paper documents that describe the connectivity of the storm water network? (Answer: no, although it is likely that at least some sources are available at King County.)

7. Which geodatabase format does the city prefer, personal or file-based? (Answer: personal geodatabase format will suffice for this work.)

8. Will the city consider deliverables to be submitted as quarter-section "tiles"? (Answer: this is a negotiable item; tiling needs to address how crossing features are to be managed in the final, one-piece GIS data layer.)

9. What attributes will be required for right-of-way polygons? (Answer: none)

10. What are the conventions currently utilized to identify the ROW polygons within the city limits? (Answer: the King County Assessments quarter section maps, plats, and recorded surveys are reliable sources for the existence of public rights-of-way.)

11. In regard to easements, please clarify the statement "with obvious geometric ties to real property boundaries." (Answer: Parcels should be mapped first so that any easements that reference a property boundary can be reliably mapped from that base feature. For example, the easement covers the south 10 feet of Lot 2 and the north 5 feet of Lot 3.)

12. Will the city provide copies of easements which do not appear on the King County Assessor maps or on recorded plat? (Answer: the city has no source materials in the annexation area, so firms proposing to do parcel and easement mapping should consider source research as an important startup task.)

13. What attribute values will be required for the address points? How does the city currently manage address information for the address point layer? How are multifamily and apartment building addresses manipulated? Are relationship classes utilized between the address points and the parcels that contain them? (Answer: see appendix at end of document for address attributes. The city has a designated address gatekeeper who authorizes new, retired, or modified addresses and forwards such changes to the GIS group. Building complexes are handled as shown in the sample data. No relationship classes exist between the parcels and address points.)

14. Does the city currently manage a street intersection (point) layer? (Answer: no)

15. Are sidewalks to be captured as closed polygons? What are the required attributes for this data layer? (Answer: Sidewalk features are lines in the city's GIS; see sample data and appendix at the end of this document.)

16. Is the city's GIS currently being managed with the Washington State Plane, NAD 83, North Zone, Feet map projection? (Answer: yes.)

17. Will the city's IT Department make a secure FTP site available for electronic submittals? (Answer: yes.)

18. Will the city have adequate staff resources available for the review of GIS deliverables? Which departments will do this? (Answer: Yes, IT/GIS and Public Works.)

19. Is there a data sharing agreement between the city and the agencies noted at the top of RFP page 16? (Answer: Kirkland exchanges data with many public agencies on an informal basis. For the work covered in this RFP, vendors will need to contact other agencies directly, not through the city, to obtain necessary records.)

20. Will King County Assessor's data be provided? Should parcel anomalies be provided as a point feature layer? (Answer: Obtaining sources from King County or elsewhere will be the responsibility of the vendor[s]. The city wants problem features to be flagged with a point layer or other workable scheme.)

21. Is the street deliverable a network dataset or line segments connected at intersection nodes? (Answer: line segments connected at their ends.)

22. Does "address point" mean a feature offset from the ROW edge for each residence structure in a parcel? (Answer: the address points do not reference the ROW, but rather entrances to buildings, parks, multifamily complexes, etc.)

23. Please clarify the requirements for the vertical control features layer. (Answer: this GIS data set will be placed in the FTP 2010_RFP folder later today or tomorrow.)

24. Is metadata part of each deliverable? (Answer: yes.)

25. Is there a difference in the type of digital data from surveying and primary mapping? (Answer: survey data is to be used in the creation of the parcel mapping, but should be maintained as separate records with security restrictions.)

26. I recently received an RFP notice issued by Barry L. Scott, C.P.M., which lists an estimated cost of $100,000 - $150,000, however the Daily Journal of Commerce (DJC) notice lists a budget of $100,000 - $500,000 for this project. Could you please clarify the apparent discrepancy? (Answer: the range is $100,000 - $150,000)

27. Has funding been secured and specifically allocated to the project? (Answer: yes.)

28. For those tax parcels whose boundaries are not supported by recorded surveys, plats or basic aliquot part descriptions, will title report legal descriptions be provided to the consultant? (Answer: see 12 and 20., above. The vendor is responsible for obtaining sources for this mapping; if sources are weak or non-existent, these parcels are to be flagged.)

29. Can we get a sample of the existing City data? (Answer: see FTP site.)

30. Who created the existing City data (the City staff or outside contractor)? (Answer: a combination of both; majority by outside vendors.)

31. What are the source materials for the parcel mapping work? (Answer: see 12, 20, and 28, above.)

32. Do we get free access to recorded surveys to be used for the actual parcel delineation, or do we have to consider this cost in our response? (Answer: see 12, 20, and 28, above.)

33. Will the annexation affect the current city limits, and if so, how will we be able to obtain the horizontal survey control data for the annexation. Do we have to consider this cost as art of our response? (Answer: as stated in the RFP, this annexation will enlarge Kirkland by about 60%. The city believes that for most of annexation area there is adequate horizontal survey control available through King County, Washington Department of Transportation, and possibly other sources. See 12, 20, and 28, above.)

34. Under III Scope of Work the statement that "recorded surveys" will be used for the actual delineation of parcels. Does this mean that the parcels will be calculated according to land survey standards tied to found monumentation? (Answer: The city desires the most accurate parcel mapping that it can get for the available budget, but emphasizes that this work is for GIS purposes and is unlikely to meet the stringent standards practiced by the land surveying profession. Ties to PLSS (and possibly other) monumentation, and the direct involvement of surveying professionals in this work, will offer the best chance of obtaining a reasonably accurate product.)

35. What are the accuracy standards for the horizontal and vertical networks? Will these need to fit with Federal Blue Book standards? (Answer: All horizontal and vertical survey control for the city has been developed by licensed land surveyors. We would need to review the specs and documentation on those projects to identify the accuracies obtained. This work is not certified by any Federal agencies.)

36. The ad listed the estimated cost at $100,000 to $150,000. Is this amount for the pilot test area? Or is this amount for the entire annexation area? (Answer: the entire annexation area.)

37. Page 9 of the RFP references an Equal Opportunity Affidavit to be included as part of Form 1. However, this attachment is not included in the Attachments section. Will the City provide vendors with this attachment? (Answer: yes.)

38. Form 4 - do we show all of the required information for the both firms? - this can be done very simply by adding a column to the form in order show the information for both firms. Also do we need audited financial statements and credit references for both firms? Do we include termination information for both firms? (Answer: prime firm only is requested.)

39. Form 5 - do we show the key employees for both firms? - can we add a column to the form that states which of the firms the employee is employed by? (Answer: prime firm only is requested.)

40. Form 6 - do we include background information for key employees of both firms? (Answer: prime firm only is requested.)

41. Form 7 - are we limited to the number of customer references we include in the proposal? Or can we show a list of customer references (5 private and 5 public) for each firm? (Answer: prime firm only is requested.)

42. Form 8 - do we show the staff assignments for both firm? (Answer: prime firm only is requested.)

43. My last question regards the Fee Schedule on Page 13. It states that we are to provide a fee estimate for vertical control yet I do not find reference to this in the Scope of Work provided on Pages 14 - 17. Do we provide a fee estimate for vertical control? (Answer: yes, if this is a service you provide, it would be helpful to the city for planning purposes.)

44. The text trails off on pilot methodology (page 16): "…proposers are free to…(?) (Answer: Proposers are free to recommend any approach that can be shown to meet the city's business needs.)

45. Task 1 – Kickoff Meeting (p 15) talks about the project plan. Is it the city's intent to have the successful Proposer prepare a more detailed project plan prior to this meeting or is a review of the proposed project plan what you have in mind? (Answer: the city does not want to use up valuable budget or schedule on extensive ramp-up planning; what is envisioned is a fairly brief memo that lays out the methodology succinctly so that work may begin at the earliest possible time.)

46. What is the timeframe desired by the city? (Answer: the city would like the parcels done by the end of 2010 if at all possible. Budget permitting, the street network and address points should be mapped by May 1 2011. The city has not determined a timeline for the other data layers.

47. Will you require a survey firm responding to this RFP be licensed as a Professional Land Surveyor in the State of Washington or would an Oregon PLS be acceptable? (Answer: for the purposes of this solicitation, an Oregon PLS is acceptable.)

A P P E N D I X

Suggested attributes for GIS data layers:

Addresspoints   PRIM_NUM
                       FRACTION
                       UNIT_TYPE
                       UNIT_NUM
                       PREFIX
                       NAME
                       TYPE
                       SUFFIX
                       BLDGNO

Crosswalks   <none>

Easements   RECORD_NUM (if available)

Own_Parcels   PIN
                       FLAG

ROW_Trees   LATINNAM
                       ENGLISHNAM
                       DIAMETER2
                       HEIGHT2
                       SPREAD2

Sidewalks	MATERIAL
Signs	COMMENTS (sign type)
Storm_Lines	LINE_TYPE SIZE_ MATERIAL
Storm_Struct	NODE_TYPE CB_TYPE SIZE_
Streetlights	\<none\>
Streetnet	THEO_L_F_A THEO_L_T_A THEO_R_F_A THEO_R_T_A NAME PRETYPE TYPE SUFFIX
Trails	MATERIAL